8

STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

TWELFTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

DOORDARSHAN — PRODUCTION OF PROGRAMMES IN-HOUSE AND BY OUTSIDE PRODUCERS

EIGHTH REPORT

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

February, 1999/Magha, 1920 (Saka)

CORRIGENDA TO THE EIGHTH REPORT

PAGE NO.	PARA NO.	LINE NO.	FOR	READ
18	63	1	"from"	"for"
28	100	13	Add after subject/theme - "the Committee desires that fresh norms/procedure for enlistment of producers should be laid down and the Committee be apprised of the same."	
28	101	4	"advice"	"advise"
29	105	6	"luck"	"lack"
37	129	16	add after scientific -	"manner"
48	163	1	"no"	"to"
71			Add :- "Annexure"	

Modifications as carried out by the Committee in its Eighth Report

PAGE	PARA	LINE	MODIFICATIONS
28	100	13	Add after subject/theme - "the Committee desires that fresh norms/procedure for enlistment of producers should be laid down and the Committee be apprised of the same."

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

February, 1999/Magha, 1920 (Saka)

EIGHTH REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

(TWELFTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

DOORDARSHAN—PRODUCTION OF PROGRAMMES IN-HOUSE AND BY OUTSIDE PRODUCERS

Presented to Lok Sabha on .....

Laid in Rajya Sabha on .....

25 0299
25 0299

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

February, 1999/Magha, 1920 (Saka)

C. O. C. No. 08

Price : Rs. 30.00

© 1999 By Lok Sabha Secretariat

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Ninth Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, 13/10, W.E.A., Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110 005.

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ..... (iii)

INTRODUCTION ..... (v)

CHAPTER I IN-HOUSE PRODUCTION OF PROGRAMMES

I. Introductory 1

II. Staff and Resource Constraints 2

III. Central Production Centre 8

IV. Revenue Earning Vs. Achievement of Objectives 13

CHAPTER II PROGRAMME PRODUCED BY OUTSIDE PRODUCERS

CHAPTER III Miscellaneous

I. Undue Extension to Some Serials and Depiction of Unethical Scenes 33

II. Cable Piracy 34

III. Programme Evaluation 36

IV. Script Piracy 37

V. Acknowledgement of Proposals and Viewers Letters 40

VI. Scheme for Awards/Prizes 42

VII. Grievances Redressal Machinery 43

APPENDICES

I. Minutes Dated 14.01.1997 49

II. Minutes Dated 24.01.1997 51

III. Minutes Dated 05.06.1997 (forenoon) 53

IV. Minutes Dated 05.06.1997 (afternoon) 55

V. Minutes Dated 14.08.1998 57

VI. Minutes Dated 24.08.1998 60

VII. Minutes Dated 25.08.1998 63

VIII. Minutes Dated 17.12.1998 66

IX. Minutes Dated 11.02.1999 68

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

Shri Somnath Chatterjee — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Jay Krishna Mandal
3. Shri K.L. Sharma
4. Shri Mahesh Kumar Mithabhai Kanodia
5. Shri Chandrashekhar Sahu
6. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh
7. Shri Nakli Singh
8. Shri Rajveer Singh
9. Shri Baijnath Rawat
10. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
11. Smt. Sheela Gautam
12. Shri Somjibhai Punjabhai Damor
13. Shri Giridhar Gamang
14. Dr. (Smt.) Prabha Thakur
15. Shri Madan Vishwanath Patil
16. Shri Dowarka Prashad Bairwa
17. Shri K. Asungba Sangtam
18. Smt. Nishaben Amarsinhbhai Chaudhari
19. Shri Shantilal Purushottamdas Patel
20. Shri T. Govindan
*21. Shri Rizwan Zaheer Khan
22. Shri P. Rajarethinam

*Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 25 June, 1998 in place of Shri Beni Prasad Verma who has been nominated as Member of Standing Committee of Finance *vide*. Bulletin Part-II, No. 338 dated 25 June, 1998.

23. Shri Surendra Prasad Yadav (Jhanjharpur)
24. Shri Mahendra Baitha
25. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy
26. Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil
27. Shri M. Durai
28. Shri P.C. Thomas
29. Shri A. Ganeshamurthi
30. Shri Surender Singh

Rajya Sabha

31. Smt. Veena Verma
*32. Ms. Mabel Rebello
33. Shri K. Rahman Khan
34. Smt. Chandresh Kumari
35. Shri Kanak Mal Katara
36. Shri Shatrughan Sinha
37. Shri Narendra Mohan
38. Shri Dawa Lama
39. Shri K. Kalavenkata Rao
40. Shri Raj Babbar
41. Shri R. Margabandu
42. Shri R.N. Arya
43. Shri Kuldip Nayyar
44. Shri Mrinal Sen
45. Shri Kartar Singh Duggal

SECRETARIAT

1. Dr. A.K. Pandey	—	*Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.D.T. Achary	—	*Joint Secretary*
3. Shri S.K. Sharma	—	*Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri A.S. Chera	—	*Under Secretary*

*Nominated to the Committee w.e.f. 17 July, 1998 in place of Sh. Moolchand Meena who ceased to be a Member of the Committee consequent on his retirement from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 4 July, 1998.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman Standing Committee on Communications (1998-99) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on its behalf, present this Eighth Report on Doordarshan Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers relating to Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.

2. The Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting at its sittings held on 24.1.1997 and 5.6.1997. The Committee took further oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting as well as those of Prasar Bharati at its sittings held on 14.08.1998, 24.08.1998 and 25.08.1998.

3. The Committee wishes to express its thanks to the representatives of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and Prasar Bharati for appearing before the Committee and placing before it the detailed information that the Committee desired in connection with the examination of the subject. The Committee is also thankful to Shri Gopal Saksena, Retired Director, Central Production Centre (Doordarshan) as well as to Shri Shanti Prasad Agarwal, Retired Controller of Programmes (Doordarshan) for appearing before the Committee as non-official witnesses on 14.1.1997 and placing before it valuable information desired in connection with the examination of the subject.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at its sitting held on 11.2.1999.

5. For facility of reference and convenience, the observations and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the body of the Report.

NEW DELHI;
11 *February*, 1999
22 *Magha*, 1920 *(Saka)*

SOMNATH CHATTERJEE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Communications.

CHAPTER I

IN-HOUSE PRODUCTION OF PROGRAMMES

I. Introductory

In-house production primarily concerns news, special audience programmes, developmental programmes, national programme of music, dance, coverage of sports activities, programmes on anniversaries and festivals and coverage of important political and socio-cultural events through live outdoor broadcast and TV reports. In addition, depending upon the resources and manpower at different Doordarshan Kendras, the production staff at the Kendras produce variety of other programmes such as documentaries, tele-serials and tele-films. There are forty-two programme production centres which undertaken in-house production—both studio based and outdoors.

2. So far as programmes produced by outside producers obtained on royalty basis are concerned, they are programmes like feature films, film songs, documentaries and short films produced by outside producers at their own expense and offered to Doordarshan for the purpose of telecast on royalty basis as per the rates fixed by the Government from time to time. Commissioned programmes are the programmes which are assigned to outside producers by providing funds under Doordarshans' special software schemes the main objective being to encourage and enlist competent producers for the production of quality programmes. These commissioned programmes cover a wide range of subjects like news and current affairs, national integration, communal harmony, social welfare, democracy and socialism, matters of interest to women, children, youth and senior citizens, science and technology, sports, music and dance, cultural trends in society, welfare of tribals and the socially backward, health, hygiene and family welfare, anniversaries, festivals and centenaries besides special campaigns. The formats of presentation include telefilms, serials, feature films, documentaries news, features, field based programmes, interviews etc. Under the sponsorship scheme, a producer is required to bear the production cost of programmes besides paying Doordarshan a sponsorship fee as per the approved rate card operative at that particular time. In liew thereof the producer/sponsor is entitled to get a fixed amount of Free Commercial Time (FCT) on sponsors.

II. Staff and Resource Constraints

3. The CEO, Prasar Bharati informed the Committee that coverage of Doordarshan programmes was 86 per cent population-wise and 72 percent area-wise. About the funds requirement, he informed the Committee that for the Ninth Plan, they had projected Rs. 3,135 crore but the allocation was only Rs. 1,836 crore. The internal generation was stated to be Rs. 466 crore during 1995-96, Rs. 614 crore during 1996-97 and Rs. 640 crore during 1997-98.

4. As regards funds and resources, the Committee ascertained that Prasar Bharati depended on its own generation and also on funds from the Ministry. According to the Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Prasar Bharati earned revenue through the commercials but that met only a fraction of their total requirements. Therefore, the budgetary support and the plan support were essential. If Prasar Bharati came back either with some revised proposals or a perspective plan then, it would be the effort of the Ministry to secure as much amount as possible from the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance, which would then be spent on extension of the network and on augmentation.

5. The Secretary further submitted that it was not reasonable to expect that all the funds would either be available initially or at one time and priorities and sequencing were to be decided on the basis of available and assured funds.

6. The Committee asked whether any Perspective Plan was prepared as to how and when Doordarshan would be able to cover the remaining areas and the resources required for it. The CEO, Prasar Bharati replied that the Perspective Plan was ready on the basis of which it was intended to cover 90 percent of the country, which will require an investment estimated at Rs. 225 crore which had been asked for by Doordarshan (DD).

7. When asked whether the amount asked for was sufficient, the CEO replied that Rs. 225 crore would be spent primarily for extending the network to North-East as most of the States in the region were under-covered and with such coverage 90 percent of the people would have access to Doordarshan.

8. The Committee, on enquiry, ascertained that, upon request made by Prasar Bharati, the amount may be made available by a possible revision of the Ninth Plan.

9. The Committee has been informed that a Perspective Plan had earlier been made ready by Doordarshan but it needed revision and updating and Prasar Bharati was taking steps to revise the Perspective Plan, which will be more thorough and more realistic.

10. Regarding the number of Production Centres and staff therein, the CEO apprised the Committee that there were 42 Production Centres all over the country and the total staff employed was about 19,000 of which programme staff was around 5,000 and the Production staff 9000.

11. When asked whether all the 42 Production Centres were adequately staffed, the CEO replied that out of these 42 Kendras, the State-Capital Kendras were more or less fully staffed. The other Kendras were actually a legacy of the past when there were no satellites. So, in some States some Kendras were set up to produce programmes because the programmes telecast from the Central transmitter did not reach them.

12. When the Committee asked about the quality of the equipment, the CEO, Prasar Bharati replied that the equipment used are old and badly require replacement. In 1997, Prasar Bharati purchased equipment worth Rs. 130 crores which consisted of cameras etc. falling in category 'C' equipment. In 1998, those equipments are being augmented by new equipments and facilities. The CEO further stated that replacement of equipments was a continuous process.

13. The Committee asked whether the procurement of equipments and production facilities had kept pace with the expansion of network. The CEO replied that in 1997, they had 6 HPTs, 69 LPTs and 43 VLPTs In 1998 with Rs. 450 crore, 13 studios, 9 HPTs, 100 LPTs/ VLPTs and 6 uplinking stations has been targeted. So far as replacement of equipments is concerned, in 1997 Prasar Bharati replaced 100 cameras, 70 ENG equipments and 39 VCRs which had become obsolete. Besides, augmentation of several equipments was also undertaken. In addition, 12 new equipments like non-linear editing, computer graphing etc. were introduced.

14. The CEO simultaneously stated that while expanding the area of optimums utilisation the existing facilities should be given equal importance.

15. When asked whether the infrastructure available with Doordarshan was used optimally, it was stated that Doordarshan's in-house facilities were actually over-utilised. Each Kendra was designed to produce and telecast a specific number of programmes keeping in view its service requirements. However, over the years while the latter has increased manifold, the resources and manpower have not been augmented proportionately.

16. During evidence, the Committee wanted the Ministry to throw more light on the over-utilisation of in-house facilities and the constraints, if any in staff and resource augmentation. The representative of the Ministry apprised the Committee that on the programme side there had been shortage of staff to the extent of 40 percent. He elaborated that the Central Production Centre (CPC) where all the in-house programmes were produced had an increased performance to the tune of 39.5 percent during 1996 vis-a-vis 1995. But due to heavy shortage of cameramen the CPC was facing serious constraints. Apart from it, there are shortcomings in infrastructure and production and other allied facilities also.

17. As regards the shortage of cameramen, in answer to the query of the Committee, the Additional Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting submitted that the total sanctioned strength of cameramen Grade-I was 92, the existing strength was 84 and the number of vacancies was 8. The total sanctioned strength of cameramen Grade-II was 505, the present strength 355 and the posts vacant were 150. About cameramen Grade-III the sanctioned strength was 150, the existing strength was 30 and the vacancies 120. The witness further stated that the Fifth Pay Commission has recommended non continuance of cameramen Grade-III posts as they were time-cadre posts.

18. To this the Committee pointed out that the Cameramen were the backbone of the whole network and if those posts were not optimally filled up, how Doordarshan would be able to do justice to its viewers, besides meeting the severe competition of foreign channels which were of technically superior qualities namely; Star, Zee etc. In reply, the Director General, Doordarshan stated that in order to improve

the situation arising out of the shortage of cameramen some extraordinary facilities were being accorded to the cameramen keeping in view the fact such employees resisted from being posted anywhere else other than the Metropolitan cities. Moreover, the number of cameramen who sought voluntary retirement was gradually increasing because they found other greener pastures in the major metropolitan cities. To counter it, Doordarshan, in very deserving cases was providing facilities like better housing at the place of posting and at the headquarters, with an assurance of transfer to Headquarters.

19. The DG, Doordarshan further clarified that since Union Public Service Commission was taking time to recruit cameramen for reasons beyond their control Doordarshan took permission from Government to recruit cameramen Grade III at each Kendra level and was in the process of recruiting them.

20. To a specific query of the Committee whether the Cameramen did not want to join Doordarshan due to lower pay sales *vis-a-vis* its foreign/private counterparts and if it was so how Doordarshan would be able to cope up with the situation, the DG Doordarshan replied that so long as Doordarshan is a part of the Government, not only cameramen but other staff members also would be going away if they found other better openings. The basic problem was that in the Government Sector once the salaries of equivalent cadres was increased in one Department, all the other Government Departments would ask for the same. But after Doordarshan came under Prasar Bharati and became a Corporation, there was a chance of giving higher pay scale to the staff members and thereby retaining them in service.

21. To this, the Committee pointed out that though Doordarshan after becoming a Corporation could undoubtedly be able to improve the salary structure of the cameramen and other staff members, yet it may not be case of increase in salary alone. The Committee enquired how Doordarshan would encourage and stimulate the creative mind of its staff, particularly cameramen. The DG agreed to it and stated that there were many other factors *i.e.* lack of freedom, poor promotional avenue, low morale etc. besides the pay structure, for which the cameramen were either not interested to join Doordarshan or were interested in leaving it.

22. The Committee wanted to have the views of an eminent non-official witness as to how to check the exodus of cameramen and

other staff members of Doordarshan. He deposed before the Committee and stated that the main motivations to a true professional or even to an ordinary professional were respectability, credit and acceptability. He added that to deal with the issue of exodus the technical staff particularly should be given proper pay and proper facilities. Even a TV set was not provided to a producer. The reason is that in the hierarchy, his pay was lower (for entitlement) and so he could not be given a TV set. At the most, he would be provided with a black and white set, which would not enable him to judge the quality of a programme. Such members are also not provided with telephones at their residence, which was necessary, on the plea that such employees were not in the entitled category.

23. The Committee asked Prasar Bharati about its views on the problem of exodus and of the measures taken to check it. The CEO, Prasar Bharati stated in evidence that the exodus problem was unavoidable in every large organisation. Moreover, although the Fifth Pay Commission had recommended a very liberal pay scale yet it might be very difficult to match the salary structure of the Private Organisations. The CEO, however, stated that by giving the employees greater opportunities and training, exodus of talented people could be checked.

24. The Committee notes that the coverage of Doordarshan in terms of population and area is 86 per cent and 72 per cent respectively. The Committee further notes that Prasar Bharati's revenue earning through the Commercials would remain only a fraction of their requirements. The budgetary and plan support will have to continue in order to enable them to cover the remaining areas. The exact amount of money required and asked for by Prasar Bharati for coverage of remaining parts of the country—mainly the North East where most of the States are under covered would be Rs. 225 crores. But this amount has not yet been received by Prasar Bharati. However, the Committee notes as has been observed by the Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting that funds would be made available during the coming year's Annual Plan or by possible revision in the Ninth Plan based upon Prasar Bharati's Perspective Plan. The Committee would, therefore, like Prasar Bharati to expedite formulation of a thorough and realistic Perspective Plan and place it before the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, who in turn should persuade the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance to obtain the necessary allocation so that the

remaining areas, especially in the North-East, are covered by Doordarshan.

25. The Committee notes the observation of the Secretary of Information and Broadcasting that it is not reasonable on the part of Prasar Bharati to expect that all the required funds will be available by way of one time payment or within a very short time and as such the Committee recommends that priorities and sequencing instead of overall requirements be accorded greater importance. Further side by side with expansion, augmentation of the existing facilities demand due attention. Therefore, along with planned expansion, Prasar Bharati should strive for better quality of their programmes and technology.

26. The Committee is surprised to note that on the side of programming there has been shortage of staff to the extent of 40 per cent. The shortage is more serious in case of cameramen Grades I, II and III where there are shortfalls of 8, 150 and 120 posts respectively. Although Doordarshan had taken permission from the Government to recruit cameramen Grade III locally at Kendra level, the recommendation of the Fifth Pay Commission to revive a dying cadre called "Lighting Assistants" at the cost of the abolition of cameramen Grade III posts has posed a problem for recruitment of these cameramen. However, the Committee has noted the submission of DG, Doordarshan that once the Pay Commission Report is implemented, they would forward their representation and appeal to appropriate bodies. Now that the Pay Commission Report has been implemented, the Committee would like to stress upon Doordarshan, Prasar Bharati and the Ministry to break the impasse regarding the recruitment and continuance of cameramen Grade III. Further, serious efforts should be made to recruit other categories of cameramen and programme staff who are the backbone of the whole network. The Committee feels that if these posts are not optimally filled up Doordarshan would not be able to do justice to its viewers, besides meeting the competition from the technically much superior private channels.

27. The Committee is deeply concerned to note that exodus of talented people from Doordarshan has assumed serious proportions over the years. Lack of freedom, poor promotional avenues, low morale etc. besides inadequate pay structure are stated to be the

reasons behind such exodus. Although Doordarshan is extending some facilities to its cameramen and other staff, they seem to be grossly inadequate in view of the number of posts, especially cameramen, that are lying vacant and the number of staff that has left the organisation over the years. The CEO, Prasar Bharati's submission that exodus problem is unavoidable in any large organisation is not convincing in view of the role assigned to Doordarshan. In this context, the statement of non-official witness that even basic facilities like a colour T.V. set or a telephone is not provided to a producer on the plea that he is not in the entitled category requires serious consideration. The Committee agrees that it is very difficult to match the salary structure of private organisations even after the implementation of the Fifth Pay Commission Recommendations. But Doordarshan should be able to provide some basic facilities as stated above. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommends that Doordarshan should bestow some respectability on its staff members by recognising the fact that functional responsibilities should be taken into account rather than the hierarchical considerations in providing perquisites/amenities. Besides, granting functional freedom, encouragement, recognition and motivation through promotional avenues, merit certificates and awards/prizes, which will definitely not cost much, Doordarshan would be able to recruit and retain the talented staff. The Committee expects that Doordarshan, Prasar Bharati and the Ministry would take all necessary steps at an early date before it becomes too late.

28. The Committee is concerned to note that equipment in Doordarshan are old and require large scale replacement, although Prasar Bharati has purchased equipment worth Rs. 130 crore in 1997 and replaced 100 cameras, 70 Electronic News Gathering (ENG) equipments and 39 VCRs which had become useless due to obsolescence. The Committee would like to stress that procurement and augmentation of equipment and production facilities should keep pace with the expansion of Doordarshan network, more so in view of the stiff challenge that is being faced from private channels.

III. Central Production Centre (CPC)

29. One ex-Director of Central Production Centre (CPC) who appeared before the Committee as a non-official witness apprised the Committee that the Central Production Centre (CPC) was established by Doordarshan as a centre of excellence with a specific purpose of

producing in-house programmes of high quality. The dual responsibility of production as well as transmission of programmes was, however, not entrusted with the CPC unlike Doordarshan's operational centres (DDKs). Therefore, CPC was required to devote only to the production of programmes, which have been more or less of high quality. But unfortunately the programmes produced by CPC were not telecast at all or were telecast at odd hours at 11 p.m. or even later which has not helped in motivating the Producers to attain higher standards.

30. The Central Production Centre (CPC) was set up by Doordarshan in 1988 as the main production centre of Doordarshan for all in-house programmes. When CPC was contemplated, state-of-the-art equipment and technology was set up with two studios and various other facilities. About the location of these studios, the DG informed the Committee that the CPC alongwith its studios is located in various buildings at Siri Fort. The studios have been expected to produce on an average, about 100 hours of programmes in a year. For each hour of programme the studio was put to use, on the average, for about 10 hours.

31. Replying to a query of the Committee as to whether the recording of in-house programmes took place only in CPC or regional studios were also utilised for the purpose, DG Doordarshan stated that apart from the CPC studios, the regional Kendra studios were also being utilised. As regards the extent of utilisation of the facilities that are available at CPC, the representative of Doordarshan submitted that there are two shifts in each studio, from 8.30 A.M. till 3.00 P.M. and from 3.30 P.M. to 10 P.M. Each studio has got a provision of four cameras, of which, three cameras were utilised and one was kept as a standby and was used occasionally.

32. About the availability of cameraman, technicians etc. in CPC, the Committee was informed that there was an acute shortage of cameramen. To be precise, against 18 sanctioned posts of cameramen only nine were available in CPC.

33. It is reported that for 1996-97, budget of CPC was of the order of Rs. 1.10 crore, which included also the travel costs of top grade artists who were given air fare and accommodation in Three Star or equivalent hotels. Doordarshan followed the concept of centralised programming in Delhi as the equipments were in Delhi and the Central Production Centre is also located there.

34. In view of the meagre budgetary provisions and problems like shortage of cameramen etc., the Committee wanted to know the utility of having two studios at Delhi and whether the Ministry could also produce CPC programmes at different regional Kendras. The Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting replied that programmes like the New Year's Eve which were meant for the entire Doordarshan Network were made in the CPC, as well as programmes like open Forum, Panel Discussions etc. when there were important events like General Election. Mainly programmes meant for National Channel were produced in the CPC.

35. It has been clarified by the concerned Ministry that the regional Kendras can be utilised for producing programmes for National Channel as well, so that costs would be less.

36. As regards the availability of modern and state-of-the-art cameras in CPC for production of in-house programmes, the Committee was apprised by the representative of the Ministry that the cameras for the CPC had been purchased prior to 1987 and had been in use for eight to nine years. Since then there has been considerable improvement in technology and they were no more state-of-the art cameras although in excellent state. However, due to fund constraints these cameras could not be replaced. The DG, Doordarshan supplemented that one of the problems of Doordarshan was that it could not keep pace with the improvement in technology since Doordarshan had to go through dilatory procedures and tenders whereas the competing channels would be able to make this acquisition much more quickly.

37. Doordarshan can not any longer avoid competition with private including foreign channels. But with constraint in budgetary allocations, shortage of cameramen and lack of state-of-the-art equipments, it will be a difficult task for Doordarshan unless its technical competence was upgraded. The Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in reply stated that acquisition of equipments and modernisation and replacement of equipments was an on-going process. He, however, admitted that there was definite shortage of staff and equipment as well as constraints of funds with which Doordarshan and the Ministry were trying their best to satisfy as many demands as possible.

38. The Committee wanted to know how many programmes produced by the CPC had not been shown on Doordarshan and

whether it was a fact that programmes produced by the CPC were generally shown at very odd hours and if so the reasons therefor. The DG, Doordarshan replied that around 20 per cent of programmes produced by the CPC had not been shown on Doordarshan because for accommodating these programmes some existing programmes/ serials which were giving Doordarshan a lot of revenue would have to be discontinued. He accepted the fact that Doordarshan's in-house production programmes and commissioned programmes did not generally get prime time (which fetches the maximum revenue) and therefore, CPC programmes generally got relegated to other time slots and agreed that it was one of the dissuading factors for the production of good programmes.

39. The Committee is surprised to know that around 20 per cent of the programmes produced by the CPC have not seen the light of the day and the rest were shown at very odd hours and wonders whether there is any utility of having such a centre.

40. The Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting replied that the type of programmes which were produced by the CPC had a certain committed viewership and therefore, even if they were not coming exactly at prime time those who wanted to see them would definitely see them. He agreed that balance between the revenue earning and the non-revenue earning programmes will have to be done.

41. The Committee again wondered that if 20 per cent programmes produced in CPC remained in cans then how Doordarshan was helping the attainment of its avowed objectives. The DG submitted that the CPC was originally envisaged for a large number of in-house productions, but in view of the other mandate given to Doordarshan to raise revenue they had to accommodate sponsored programmes and the percentage of sponsored programmes on Doordarshan has dramatically gone up in the last two to three years, due to its emphasis on raising more revenues. The DG further submitted that CPC functioned as a programme bank for Doordarshan. In case of emergency when certain programmes could go off the air suddenly some programme from the bank of programmes could be put on air immediately.

42. The Committee is unhappy to note that there is an acute shortage of cameramen even in Central Production Centre which

was set up in 1988 as the main Production Centre of Doordarshan for its in-house programmes. The Committee is further concerned to note that the cameras for CPC were purchased prior to 1987 and therefore, they are no more suitable but due to fund constraints the cameras could not be replaced. The Committee fails to understand how with an acute shortage of cameramen and without state-of-the-art cameras, CPC would be projected as a centre of excellence for in-house activities. In fact, these basic constraints have resulted in deterioration of Doordarshan's in-house programmes which has become more glaring after the advent of the technically superior private channels. The Committee, therefore, urges Doordarshan, Prasar Bharati and the Ministry to make concerted efforts to recruit adequate number of cameramen and acquire state-of-the-art cameras so that the purpose for which CPC was created is not defeated. The Committee would further like to recommend that, as has been pointed in some succeeding paragraphs, the experienced cameramen should be given some incentives in the shape of freedom, respectability, awards/prizes etc. so that they feel interested to join and remain in Doordarshan. Further, by sponsoring some programmes produced by CPC, Doordarshan should be able to raise necessary funds for purchasing modern cameras.

43. The Committee is of the view that Doordarshan should constantly have state-of-the-art technology available to it as it has to compete with private channels with technological superiority. In this context, the Committee, would like Prasar Bharati to impress upon the Ministry for simplifying the procedures and tendering process so that state-of-the-art equipment could be purchased without any delay.

44. The Committee observes that the budget for CPC was Rs. 1.10 crore for the year 1996-97 out of which a substantial amount of money was consumed by the artists for their TA, DA and hotel bills. The Committee further notes that the concept of centralised programming in Delhi was adopted as the equipments were in Delhi and the CPC was set up at a cost of Rs. 45 crores. However, the Committee does not agree with the concept of centralised programming in the two studios of CPC at Delhi and feels that if the facilities available at other Regional Kendras are used for producing CPC programmes, the Ministry would be able to make saving out of the meagre budget provided to CPC. The Committee, therefore, recommends that other Regional Kendras should be put

to use for producing CPC programmes, for the sake of economy as well.

45. The Committee is surprised to note that around 20 per cent of the programmes produced by CPC have not been telecast and that the rest are telecast at very odd hours due to the fact that some ongoing programmes/serials are being telecast at prime time to increase its revenue earning. The DG, Doordarshan admitted that CPC Programmes get relegated to un-important time slots. This has become one of the dissuading factors for the production of good in-house programmes. Keeping CPC programmes as a programme Bank for emergent situations, as submitted by DG Doordarshan, does not serve the objective as CPC was originally envisaged as a Production Centre of excellence. Similarly the Secretary's view that even if CPC programmes are not shown exactly at Prime-time, those who want to see them would definitely see, seems to be a little far-fetched. the Committee, therefore, impresses upon both Doordarshan and the Ministry the need to make all out efforts to see that these programmes are telecast at prime time or appropriate time.

IV. Revenue Earning Vs Achievement of Objectives

46. Doordarshans, objectives *inter-alia* are to act as catalyst of social change; promote national integration, stimulate scientific temper among people; stimulate agricultural production by providing essential information and knowledge; promote preservation of environment and ecological balance; highlight social measures including welfare of women, children and less privileged provide wholesome entertainment and promote art, culture, games and sports. According to the DG Doordarshan, Doordarshan as a public broadcaster has always kept in mind its aims and objectives. But at the same time it had been assigned the onerous task of raising revenues to fund its own budget, which strictly comes into conflict in attaining its stated objectives. He further added that in order to raise more revenues, Doordarshan has gradually had to reduce its role of public broadcaster.

47. Giving the break-up, the DG, Doordarshan apprised the Committee that 40 per cent of the programmes at the national Network level were information programmes and a major portion of it was news, 30 per cent of the programmes was meant for education and entertainment.

48. The Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting supplemented the DG, Doordarshan by stating that there would always be conflict in fulfilling the objectives and earning the revenue and there would always be need to balance. To support his statement on the 'need to balance', the Secretary apprised the Committee that in the case of the National Channel, *i.e.* DD-1, programmes of shorter duration on various subjects like information, education, national integration and family welfare were and are included even at the risk of sacrificing revenue.

49. News being one of the most important and major programmes of Doordarshan's in-house productions, the Committee desired to know the steps taken by Doordarshan to improve this programme so that it could compete with private channels in respect of quality and coverage. The DG, Doordarshan in reply stated that there was an attempt to recruit News correspondents and about 25 to 30 people were recruited. But that scheme did not succeed as it was a one time recruitment and they did not have any promotional avenues. Although, some of them are still with Doordarshan, but as because Doordarshan does not intend to build up that cadre of News correspondents, they are discharging other function. He further stated that Doordarshan was doing its best to improve its own news service.

50. During evidence, the Committee pointed out that visual clippings of good quality were hardly shown in Doordarshan news as in other channels. To this the CEO, Prasar Bharati replied that the visual content of Doordarshan news had improved to a great extent as compared to what they used to be earlier. He stated that 80 per cent of news time was taken by visuals and only for 20 per cent of the news time, news reader was on the camera.

51. The Committee then asked whether Doordarshan had got any foreign correspondents. The CEO replied that Doordarshan did not have any foreign correspondents although All India Radio had got such correspondents in six/seven countries. He further stated that it was an expensive proposition to have TV correspondents all over the world.

52. The Committee then suggested that the Akashvani correspondents might be requested to do the job for Doordarshan also. To this the CEO replied that he would look into the matter.

53. As regards the facilities available at Regional Kendras to telecast news bulletins, the CEO stated that the news gathering mechanism and the reach for news gathering in Delhi was much greater because it got feedback from all the regional centres on transponders, whereas Regional Kendras either took national news from Delhi or they had their own news gathering equipments. Sometimes they purchased news from the local Agencies. Obviously the facilities available at Delhi are much greater than those at the regional centres.

54. Summing up all the constraints that were being faced by Doordarshan in giving a fillip to its in-house production of programmes, the Committee desired to know how Doordarshan proposed to maintain its public broadcaster image. The DG, Doordarshan replied that all the revenues collected by Doordarshan were not necessarily ploughed back into the development of Doordarshan. Partly it was used for development of AIR also. Secondly, unlike in other Departments, the non-plan expenditure of Doordarshan was being financed by the funds that were being raised by Doordarshan.

55. The Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting supplemented that in the discussion on Annual Plan for 1997-98, the Ministry had very strongly projected before the Planning Commission that the entire revenues of Doordarshan and AIR should come to them for developmental projects. They had also emphasized that if the Finance Ministry could not do it one go, they could at least do it phase wise *i.e.* in two or three years and even if that was accepted Doordarshan would get Rs. 50 crore more and that money would be well utilised for the purpose.

56. The Committee invited memoranda from general public. Many of the representatives allege that there is an overdoes of films and film based programmes in Doordarshan and the quality of programmes produced in-house by Doordarshan is not of the desired standard. The Committee desired to hear the views of Doordarshan/Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in this regard. It was replied that the inference that there was an overdose of films and film based programmes was not borne out by facts. These programmes actually constituted about 11 per cent of the total programme hours on the National Network and about 15 per cent in the Metro Network. It was further stated that while it was true that some in-house programmes had been less than satisfactory, many of Doordarshan's

in-house programmes over the years had been highly acclaimed despite the fact that alongwith the phenomenal growth of the organisational services during the past few years, the infrastructure had not kept pace with it. Under the circumstances, it had always been a real challenge to sustain the growing service.

57. When the Committee desired to hear the views/suggestions of the Ministry/Doordarshan in order to improve the quality of in-house programmes, some of the suggestions given are as follows :—

(i) Strict enforcement of empanelled producers is necessary, Currently even those producers who have not been empanelled by Doordarshan are some times engaged for commissioned programmes.

(ii) The required staff for previewing rough cuts has to be strengthened.

(iii) Talented producers are to be trained gradually in specialised fields so that improvement in certain areas is brought. For example, sports is an activity in which in-house production required some special aptitude and special training to all involved in such production.

(iv) Even at the cost of losing revenue, Doordarshan might have to consciously allot some prime slots for commissioned programmes to provide the required facility and motivation for the producers.

(v) Organisation of TV festivals on the line of Film festivals might improve the quality of in-house production.

(vi) The infrastructure required for in-house production both in terms of equipment and staff needed to be strengthened. For example, in News section, the major in-house production, there is shortage of latest equipments.

58. In a further note it was stated that there has been some decline in the quality of programmes produced in-house by Doordarshan owing to increasing emphasis on the procurement of sponsored programmes. But after the formation of Prasar Bharati producers in Doordarshan are being encouraged to produce quality programmes and quite a few of them have been given monetary rewards and commendation certificate for their contribution.

59. Continuing the thrust on the quality of in-house programmes, the Committee queried how in the present scenario the programmes telecast by Doordarshan compared with the rival channels quality-wise, popularity wise as well as viewer-ship wise. The DG, Doordarshan submitted that so far as the quality of Doordarshan programmes is concerned over the years Doordarshan had been selling programmes worth crores of rupees outside. For example, every year there is a conference in France where all the broadcasters took their programmes and sold them. In 1997, the representatives of Doordarshan went to Paris and came back with orders worth Rs. 2 crore. Secondly, the Malaysian Broadcasting Corporation has started DTH in their country and they purchased a lot of software from Doordarshan. They have expressed satisfaction about the quality of the production. Thirdly, demands had come from the USA and other places for Gujarati programmes which showed that there was a demand for Doordarshan programmes even from NRIs. Again, most of the producers in India are big business houses. They have been selling their programmes not only in Indian market but also outside it. They, therefore, make sure that the quality was upto the minimum standards.

60. As regards production of serials in-house the CEO, Prasar Bharati apprised the Committee that earlier serials were not being produced in-house but now three or four serials are being produced.

61. To a specific query of the Committee whether all the Regional languages were given equal importance and whether there was any plan to increase the telecast timings of the Regional languages, the CEO replied that earlier they used to be given time in the afternoon from 15.30 hours to 16.30 hours. Later, the timing was increased from 14.30 hours to 20.30 hours. The CEO further stated that there are regular review meetings, regarding the Regional languages programmes, encouraging and giving them more funds. Even on DD-II, two hours extra time has been given to Regional Channel so that it can cater to the regional needs.

62. Regarding telecast of programmes in Sanskrit language, the CEO informed the Committee that there was a weekly news bulletin. Some Hon'ble Members felt that the duration of the Sanskrit language programmes may be extended.

63. The Committee is seriously concerned that the role of Doordarshan as a public broadcaster has been reduced gradually

from the sake of raising revenue. There is an apparent conflict between attaining the objectives on one hand and raising resources on the other notwithstanding the statement of DG that Doordarshan as a public broadcaster always keeps in mind its aims and objectives and seventy per cent of programmes on National Network are information and education oriented. The Committee is of the opinion that there is a need to balance the role of Doordarshan as a public broadcaster and revenue earner. Indiscriminate emphasis on revenue generation disregarding its role of public broadcaster would certainly affect attaining its objectives. The Committee recommends that a balance should be maintained to play its role as the major public broadcaster, consistent with the necessity of raising adequate resources without affecting the quality of the programmes.

64. The Committee notes that the Ministry in the discussion on Annual Plan 1997-98 very strongly projected before the Planning Commission that the entire revenues of Doordarshan and AIR should come to them for their own developmental projects. The Committee appreciates this effort of the Ministry and would like to be apprised of the decision of the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance in this regard. The Committee would simultaneously like the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to further pursue the matter with the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance in future plan discussions also.

65. The Committee notes that there was an attempt by Doordarshan to recruit News correspondents and some persons were recruited. But the scheme did not succeed, as there was no promotional avenues and Doordarshan also did not intend to build up the cadre of News Correspondents. The Committee fails to understand why Doordarshan is reluctant to build up a cadre of News correspondents more so in view of the fact that private producers are no more engaged by Doordarshan to produce news programmes. In such a situation the News correspondents appointed by Doordarshan can effectively play the role. The Committee would, therefore, like Doordarshan to consider the revival of the scheme so that news programmes of Doordarshan are lively and current as in the private channels.

66. The Committee is glad to note that after the inception of Prasar Bharati, visual content of Doordarshan news has improved to a great extent with 80 per cent visuals. The Committee would like

Prasar Bharati to maintain and improve the standard so that the percentage and quality of visual clippings shown in Doordarshan news comes upto the standards of other competing channels.

67. The Committee notes that Doordarshan does not have any correspondents posted abroad although All India Radio has got correspondents in six/seven countries. Taking into consideration the Prasar Bharati's submission that it is an expensive proposition to have TV correspondents in other countries, the Committee would like Prasar Bharati to consider whether the Akashwani correspondents could be usefully utilised for the purpose.

68. The Committee notes that although there has been some decline in the quality of in-house programmes owing to the increasing emphasis on the procurement of sponsored programmes, after the formation of Prasar Bharati, Doordarshan in-house producers are being encouraged through monetary awards and commendation certificate to produce quality programmes. The Committee commends the steps taken by Prasar Bharati to encourage the in-house producers to come up with quality programmes. However in the Committee's view these measures are not enough to achieve excellence in in-house production. The Committee would like Prasar Bharati to impart specialised training to the talented in-house producers so that the in-house programmes of Doordarshan are qualitatively of a high order. Further, as discussed in succeeding paragraphs, Doordarshan has to allot some prime time slots to the in-house programmes even at the cost of losing some revenue.

69. The Committee is happy to observe that after the formation of Prasar Bharati, for the first time, three/four serials are being produced in-house with a view to giving much needed motivation and recognition to the Doordarshan's own producers. The Committee would like Prasar Bharati to encourage more production of in-house serials.

70. The Committee appreciates the fact that after the inception of Prasar Bharati, timing of the regional language programme has been increased by five hours. Besides, Prasar Bharati is reviewing the Regional language programmes, encouraging and giving them more funds. The Committee considers these steps to be in the right direction and would like Prasar Bharati to continue to encourage and support the development of regional language programmes. Perhaps Prasar Bharati may consider increasing the duration of the Sanskrit language programme, if feasible.

CHAPTER II

PROGRAMME PRODUCED BY OUTSIDE PRODUCERS

71. The Committee was informed that of all the programmes telecast on DD-I about 38% of programmes were produced in-house, 31% of the programmes were procured through sponsorship and about 5% of the programmes were commissioned and the remaining programmes were received either through royalty or from the Ministries like HRD etc.

72. In the Regional Kendras, 61% of the programmes have been produced in-house, 13% procured through sponsorship, about 2% commissioned and the remaining have been met through royalty or from Govt. Agencies.

73. In local Kendras, 95% of the programmes were produced in-house and the remaining were procured through other sources and on DD-II, most of the programmes are obtained through sponsorship.

74. As regards the procedure laid down for production of commissioned programmes, the Committee was informed that the proposals for commissioned programmes in the regional languages were received at the various kendras and the proposals in Hindi or English for national network were received for processing in the Directorate. The proposals received in the kendras for programmes in the regional languages were scrutinized by the Regional Committees at the Kendras. Uptill October, 1993, such proposals were forwarded to the Directorate for further processing. These proposals were further scrutinized at various levels and put before the Costing Committee for final approval and sanction. The concerned producers and the respective Doordarshan Kendras were then apprised about the decision of the Costing Committee. An agreement was, thereafter, signed between the outside producers and the Director of the Kendra spelling out the format, duration, number of episodes, mode of payment etc.

75. It was further stated that at the time of signing a contract a tentative time schedule was indicated for completion of the programme. However, depending on exigencies of the productions, in certain cases it was revised with the approval of Doordarshan. After the issuance of guidelines in May, 1993, a time schedule was prescribed for completion

of programmes. 50% of the advance granted was covered by Bank Guarantee and the remaining 50% by two sureties. In some cases when the progress had been found to be slow, the producer had been reminded to complete the production at the earliest. However, where the Producer had failed to submit/complete the programmes assigned to him in time, he was blacklisted and legal action initiated against him.

76. When asked whether any panel of producers was prepared for award of contract to outside producers, it was replied that in 1989, Zutshi Committee which included many established film producers and Directors screened through about 3,500 applications, recommended a panel of 723 producers and 582 Directors for sponsored programmes on Doordarshan. Thereafter, there had been periodical additions to the list. However, the practice of empanelment was stopped since December, 1994 and after that programmes were assigned to the producers after examining the track record of producers/Directors and other members of the technical crew as laid down in the commissioned programme guidelines.

77. During evidence the CEO, Prasar Bharati stated that earlier there used to be a panel of 400 producers for Delhi alone for commissioned programmes. But it was not a satisfactory arrangement and left a lot of scope for favouritism, patronage etc. as a result of which in several cases neither the money was recovered nor the programmes received. Therefore, that panel was scrapped and in lieu of that it was left to Prasar Bharati to decide the subject/theme on which programmes were to be produced keeping in view the track record and credentials of the producers.

78. The Committee was further informed that commissioned programmes after their completion are previewed by the officers of the Department and, if need be, outside experts are also involved. These are then considered for telecast as per programme exigencies. Efforts were made to complete the telecast within a year. In exceptional circumstances, if for unavoidable reasons outside producers approach Doordarshan for extension of time limit, the request was considered on merit and extension granted wherever warranted by the facts of the case. Twelve serials/Documentaries Commissioned by Doordarshan are stated to have not been telecast during the years 1992 to 1995 for various reasons. Prasar Bharati in a post-evidence information submitted

that there were hundreds of Commissioned Programmes lying in cans with various DD Kendras.

79. To a specific query of the Committee it has been replied that no infrastructural facilities were made available to producers under the commissioned programme scheme excepting cases where stock shots and archival materials were already available with Doordarshan. The cost of such supplies was deducted from commissioning price.

80. Regarding monitoring to check malpractices in the award of commissioned programmes to outside producers, the DG, Doordarshan apprised the Committee that in each Kendra there was a Programme Advisory Committee to advise the Director of the concerned Kendra on the Programmes. At the Directorate level, Deputy Director General of various channels and the Director General met on regular basis in two Committees—Short Listing Committee and Costing Committee, the former pertaining to sponsored programmes and the latter to commissioned programmes. Thus, in the award of programmes to outside producers, always a collective decision was taken leaving no scope for malpractices.

81. But the non-official witness differed with the above mentioned statement of the DG, Doordarshan and apprised the Committee that there were hundreds of occasions where programmes were awarded to outside producers without consulting the Committees constituted by Doordarshan. He further elaborated that anyone who could approach the Minister got the programmes. Even the Private Secretary to the Minister would get the work done over telephone.

82. To this, the Committee asked whether it was Minister alone on whose recommendation programmes were awarded to outside producers or other officials were also involved in showing favouritism towards some outside producers. The witness replied that the DG, Doordarshan or for that matter any other senior official could direct their subordinate officials to approve any programme in which they were interested on the plea that it was the wish of the Minister, which would not be verified by the subordinate officials.

83. Asked how such malpractice could be curbed, the non-official witness stated that norms/guidelines established for awarding programmes to outside producers should in no case be flouted. Programmes should be assigned to really talented people. And these

talented people should be drawn from form retired Doordarshan professionals having acceptable credentials as writers, Directors and producers as well as qualified/trained film/TV graduates coming out from established institutes whose talents needed to be nurtured and nourished in the media. Both the above categories could not be expected to have enough financial back-up of their own to initially invest in the programmes. Therefore, they should be assigned commissioned programmes.

84. Pointing towards the fact that the empanelment of producers had been stopped since December, 1994 and now programmes were assigned to producers after examining the track record of producers/ Directors and other members of the technical crew, the Committee asked how was it ensured that commissioned programmes were not monopolised by a few well-established producers and that fresh talent was encouraged. It was replied that efforts were made to encourage fresh talents by assigning them telefilms, documentaries, mini serials, programmes on current affairs etc. Some of them have produced very high quality programmes.

85. The Committee wanted to hear the views of Prasar Bharati in this regard. The CEO, Prasar Bharati deposed that they were giving special emphasis to young and talented producers in the award of commissioned programmes. For example, fresh graduates from National School of Drama (NSD) and Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) were being assigned commissioned programmes. Moreover, whenever any programme was being assigned to reputed outside producers, a condition was put that they should associate some young producers with them.

86. The CEO further stated that side by side with young producers, programmes were assigned to top class producers with a view to having programmes of top quality. The Committee asked what was the criteria for judging a producer as top class. The CEO replied that there were at least two dozen top class producers who had won National awards and recognised by the people as top class.

87. In this connection the Committee was further apprised that during the celebration of India's 50th year of Independence, Doordarshan had allotted Rs. 1 crore each to five top-class producers, namely, S/Shri Shyam Benegal, Girish Karnad, Buddhadev Das Gupta, Gautam Ghosh and Bhupen Hazarika to produce programmes for Doordarshan for the occasion.

88. When the Committee asked on what basis these five producers were selected, the Additional Secretary Ministry of Information and Broadcasting replied that they had to select one top class producer from different regions *i.e.* North, South, East, West and North-East and keeping in mind the track record and past productions of the above mentioned five producers they were allotted programmes on the occasion of 50th year of India's Independence.

89. To the Committee's apprehension whether commissioned programmes were being neglected at the cost of sponsored programmes, the DG, Doordarshan replied that they were consciously trying their best to increase the number of commissioned programmes which could be seen by the people.

90. The Committee asked whether there were instances where programmes originally envisaged as commissioned ones were later on changed to the sponsored category. It was replied in the affirmative and stated that the following commissioned programmes with the details thereof were subsequently changed to sponsored category.

(i) *Sankalp*

The proposal was originally submitted for its consideration under sponsored category on 6.6.1988. But the last date for accepting the proposals under the sponsored category was over. National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development forwarded the same proposal on 13.8.1988 to Doordarshan and the case was processed and approved the plot on 7.1.1989 @ Rs. 1,50,000/-. The party requested for transfer of the proposal to sponsored category on 8.11.1990. The party refunded the advance with interest.

(ii) *Gul Gulshan Gulfam*

The serial was approved for 15 episodes in 16 mm film format for a budget of Rs. 2,50,000/- per episode. On the request of Producer, the Directorate approved its shifting to the sponsored category and the advance taken by the Party was received back with 18% interest.

(iii) *Tenalirama*

The serial was approved for 13 episodes on 25.1.1989 @ Rs. 2,50,000/- per episode on 16 mm film. The party requested for transfer to sponsored category which was agreed to by Doordarshan. The advance was received back with 18% interest.

(iv) *Vashista Vishwamitra*

The proposal was approved for 13 episodes on 23.5.1989 @ Rs. 2,55,000/-. The proposal was transferred to sponsored category on the request of the Producer which was agreed to.

(v) *Inkar*

The proposal for 12 episodes serial was approved by Costing Committee meeting held on 3.8.1989 @ Rs. 2,00,000/- per episode. But again on the request by the Producer the project was transferred to sponsored category. The advanced amount was received back along with the interest.

(vi) *Nath*

The proposal was approved in 1989 for production of 13 episodes @ Rs. 2,00,000/- per episodes. Subsequently, the party requested for increase in number of episodes as well as transfer to sponsored category, this was not acceptable to Doordarshan. The party moved Bombay High Court. The Hon'ble Court allowed transfer of the programme to sponsored category and increase in the number of episodes to 18 subject to refund of advance with 18% interest. The producer did not refund Doordarshan money and hence the serial has been telecast as a commissioned serial.

91. During evidence, the Committee enquired about the guidelines of changing commissioned programmes into sponsored category. The DG, Doordarshan replied that the guidelines prescribed that normally the commissioned programmes should not be changed as sponsored programmes. But there are some practical problems in strictly adhering to the guidelines in this regard. To support his statement, the DG cited the case of serial "Bhootnath". The producer approached

Doordarshan and told that he wanted 100 episodes to be commissioned. Doordarshan faced a problem because they had internally put a rule for themselves that nobody should be given more than six episodes, each episode costing about Rs. 2 lakhs in view of the fact that there were instances in the past where as much as 52 episodes were commissioned. Doordarshan's dilemma not to let go a good serial and simultaneously not to give programme worth Rs. 2 crore to one producer was well felt by the producer and he told Doordarshan that he could be given six episodes after which he would get the serial sponsored. Another serial "Chandrakanta" followed suit.

92. The Committee asked about the necessity of such guidelines which could not be followed. The DG replied that the guidelines were valid in so far as Doordarshan was prepared to commission the required number of episodes on a given subject. He cited the example of another serial "Bhagwan se poochhun ya khuda se" based upon national integration which was commissioned by Doordarshan for 27 episodes. If the subject was completed within the prescribed episodes, there would be no need for sponsoring it.

93. The DG, Doordarshan simultaneously stated that basically the producers were taking advantage of the Government money in making a serial popular and getting it sponsored later on.

94. The Committee asked whether a producer would come out with a sponsored programme without knowing the time slot. The DG replied in the affirmative and apprised the Committee that he had on hand three hundred producers who had agreed to produce a programme without knowing the time at which they would be shown.

95. The Committee queried for how long these producers would be kept waiting. The DG replied that the average waiting time for a prime time slot on DD-2 would be ranging from six months to one year whereas on DD-I it would range from two years to three years and the producers were prepared to wait for that period. To another specific query, the DG replied that those producers who gave minimum guarantees and promised more revenue could jump the queue.

96. When the Committee desired to know whether the in-house productions had suffered due to sponsored programmes, the DG replied that basically in-house production was thought of when neither so many channels nor so many sponsored programmes were envisaged.

Therefore, earlier most of the programmes produced on Doordarshan were in-house productions. Secondly, the budget for in-house programmes had also a bearing on the number of programmes that they could produce.

97. The Committee then pointed out whether Doordarshan was able to get sponsor for its in-house productions *i.e.* programmes produced by Central Production Centre (CPC). The DG replied that normally there were no sponsors for the programmes produced by CPC because they came for entertainment programmes in large measure then for public broadcast programmes. He further stated that although CPC was originally envisaged for a large number of in-house productions, in view of the other mandate given to Doordarshan *i.e.* to raise revenue they had to necessarily bring in some sponsored programmes.

98. The Committee asked how sponsored programmes were approved. The DG, Doordarshan replied that the short listing Committee, in which six Deputy Directors General and as many Controllers of programmes of various channels like DD-1, DD-2, DD-3, DD-International are associated to decide together whether a sponsored programme offered by a particular producer was, first of all, required by Doordarshan at all and if required on which channel should that come.

99. In a post evidence reply, the Prasar Bharati stated that in view of the decline in the quality of Programmes, instead of relying exclusively on the proposal submitted by Private Producers on their own, some of the most eminent Producers in the country were invited to make sponsored programmes for Doordarshan and the response was most encouraging. But looking to the stature of these Producers and the fact that they were invited by Doordarshan to make programmes for it, the existing guidelines were modified as follows :

(i) These producers were not required to deposit the processing fee or go through the maze of other formalities. Their proposals were cleared on priority so as to secure their programmes for Doordarshan without any procedural delays. But in all other aspects their proposals were duly processed by the concerned Committee, they were required to submit the pilot and a suitable time slot was allotted only thereafter.

(ii) The same facility was being extended to young and budding producers who have graduated from NSD, FTII etc.

100. The Committee notes that the Panel of 400 Producers which was earlier in vogue for approval of the commissioned programmes was scrapped by Prasar Bharati because the system of having Panel of Producers had a lot of loopholes for malpractices, favouritism, patronage etc. resulting in non-receipt of programmes and non-recovery of money from the defaulting producers. The Committee is surprised over the fact that over so many years Doordarshan persisted with panel of producers which ultimately resulted in malpractices creeping into the system. The panel should have been scrapped much earlier. However, now that it has been scrapped and the responsibility has been entrusted with the Doordarshan Directorate and the Regional Kendras to identify, approach and assign programmes to competent producers besides deciding the subject/theme, the Committee hopes that talent and expertise would replace favouritism and patronage in the award of commissioned programmes.

101. As regards the monitoring system, to check malpractices in the award of Commissioned programmes to outside producers, the Committee has been informed of Programme Advisory Committee at each Kendra to advice the Director of the concerned Kendra regarding selection of programmes. Further at the Directorate level DDGs and the DG meet on regular basis in two kinds of meetings *i.e.* Short Listing Committee and the Costing Committee. But keeping in view the public complaints and the evidence tendered before it that there are hundreds of instances where programmes were awarded to outside producers without consulting the Committees constituted by Doordarshan, the Committee is inclined to conclude that the arrangements made for checking malpractices in the award of Commissioned programmes are utterly insufficient, to say the least. The Committee, therefore, recommends that norms/guidelines established for awarding programmes to outside producers should not be flouted under any circumstances or under pressure from any quarter. Committees constituted for selection of programmes should be invariably consulted and unanimous approval be taken before awarding any programme. The overall monitoring system be strengthened and accountability and responsibility be fixed. It is high time that programmes are assigned to really talented people so that Doordarshan is immunized from the charges of corruption and viewers get high-quality programmes.

102. The Committee appreciates the fact that Prasar Bharati is giving special emphasis to young and talented producers like fresh graduates from National School of Drama (NSD) and Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) in the award of Commissioned programmes. Besides these young producers, programmes are also assigned to reputed and top class producers with a view to having programmes of top quality. Hence, the Committee would like Prasar Bharati to maintain a healthy balance in the award of Commissioned programmes to these two groups.

103. The Committee further recommends that alongwith the fresh graduates from reputed Institutes, retired Doordarshan Professionals having proper credentials as Writers, Directors and Producers should also be considered for award of Commissioned programmes.

104. The Committee is surprised to note that no fresh talent was assigned any programme on the occasion of the celebration of India's 50th year of Independence although Rs. 1 crore each was allotted to five top class producers *i.e.* Shyam Benegal, Girish Karnad, Buddhadev Das Gupta, Gautam Ghosh and Bhupen Hazarika. The Committee feels that alongwith these top class producers, some fresh producers should have been given some assignment on the occasion as their talent is to be nurtured. The Committee would therefore like Doordarshan, Prasar Bharati and the Ministry to keep it in mind for future assignments.

105. The Committee notes that no infrastructural facilities are made available to outside producers under the Commissioned programme scheme. The non-official witness was also not in favour of allowing the outside producers to use Doordarshan's infrastructural facilities for various reasons like inordinate delay on the part of outside producers to complete the assigned task, luck of proper understanding of work culture amongst the outside producers on one hand and Doordarshan Professionals on the other and also emergency use of studios for V.I.Ps' interviews, statements etc. But the Committee feels that with proper planning and arrangements Doordarshan's infrastructural facilities can be made available to genuine and needy outside producers especially the first timers. In this context the Committee recommends that the feasibility of allowing the outside Producers to use Doordarshan infrastructure be explored so that there is optimum and judicious use of both infrastructure and money.

106. The Committee feels that the measures taken by Doordarshan in blacklisting and initiating legal action against the Producers who fail to submit/complete the programmes in time assigned to them is a step in right direction and should be strictly followed in all such cases. Besides the aforesaid measures, all other steps possible should be taken to recover the money with interest from the defaulting Producers.

107. The Committee notes that as per the guidelines the Commissioned Programmes should not be changed to sponsored category. But flouting these guidelines some Commissioned Programmes like 'Sankalp', 'Gul Gulshan Gulfam', 'Tenalirama', 'Inkar' etc. have been changed to sponsored category. The DG's explanation regarding change of Commissioned Programmes into sponsored programme is not satisfactory in view of his own statement that basically the Producers are taking advantage of the Government money in making a serial popular and getting it sponsored later on. Further, the DG's reply that the guidelines are valid in so far as Doordarshan is prepared to commission the required number of episodes on a given subject creates confusion. The Committee feels that guidelines should be uniformly made applicable to all and for all circumstances. When these guidelines are violated, it is bound to raise criticism. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the guidelines prescribed for commissioned and sponsored programmes should in no case be flouted for any one, irrespective of stature of the producer, so that allegations of corruption and favouritism are kept at bay in the best interest of the Organisation.

108. In this context, the Committee is happy to note Prasar Bharati's modifications of the guidelines for sponsored programmes which are applicable to both reputed Producers and to the young graduates from NSD and FTII. Both the categories are given priority and are not required to deposit the processing fee or go through the other rigmarole. Needless to mention, it is a judicious modification and the Committee would like to stress that whenever any modifications are contemplated, it should be done in such a way that it protects the interest of both the reputed and fresh producers.

109. The Committee has been informed that Producers of sponsored programmes are prepared to wait for a long period for their programmes to be telecast and that too without knowing or caring for the time slot. As a matter of fact, the sponsored programmes have outpaced the other category of programmes and become so attractive that Producers, without knowing at what time their programmes would come on the air, are prepared to wait for years together. The Committee is, however, unhappy over the submission of DG, Doordarshan that any Producer who gives minimum guarantee and promises more revenue could jump the queue. The Committee feels that this clause is against the interest of fresh producers who would not be in a position to meet the demands of Doordarshan unlike the reputed producers. The Committee, therefore recommends that the above mentioned clause be suitably modified keeping in view the plight of fresh aspirants of sponsored programmes.

110. The Committee notes that in-house productions were envisaged at a time when channels were very few and only a few sponsored programmes were anticipated. Further, the budget for in-house programmes has also a bearing on the number of such programmes that could be produced so far as Commissioned Programmes are concerned. The Committee finds little consolation in the DG's submission that even after the advent of sponsored programmes they are consciously trying their best to increase the number of Commissioned programmes in view of CEO, Prasar Bharati's admission elsewhere that a large number of Commissioned Programmes are lying in cans. It implies that the in-house programmes as well as the Commissioned Programmes have suffered a tremendous set back due to the advent of the sponsored programmes and Doordarshan's extra emphasis on earning revenue. Keeping in mind the fact that sponsored programmes are mostly entertainment programmes whereas in-house and commissioned programmes are informative and educative programmes, the Committee would like to stress that the importance and significance of in-house and commissioned programmes over the viewers should in no case be lost sight of or minimised. If Doordarshan neglects these programmes it would be doing a great disservice to the society as a whole and the younger generation in particular.

111. The Committee is unhappy to find that normally there are no sponsors for the programmes produced by Central Production Centre (CPC) as the sponsors come only for entertainment programmes in larger measure than for public broadcast programmes. The Committee is of the view that in order to motivate the in-house Producers as well as other technical staff Doordarshan should make all out efforts to find sponsors for CPC programmes. In this context, the Committee would like to cite the example of "Surabhi", which was high in Doordarshan's popularity chart despite being a completely informative and educative programme. Therefore, more programmes like "Surabhi" should be produced in-house and got sponsored so that Doordarshan's own producers and staff are able to get public recognition and encouragement to come out with more creative and quality programmes.

CHAPTER III

MISCELLANEOUS

I. Undue Extension to some Serials and Depiction of unethical scenes

112. It is generally alleged that Doordarshan has been giving undue and meaningless extensions to certain serials namely 'Swabhimaan', 'Shanti', 'Junoon' etc.

113. The Committee enquired about the reasons for undue extension being given to some serials like Shanti, Swabhimaan etc. The DG, Doordarshan during evidence, deposed before the Committee that initially when serials like 'Shanti', 'Swabhimaan' etc. were being shown at 3 P.M. or 3.30 P.M. viewership was much less. So, the producers of these serials suggested that they would develop the serials with a view to attracting more viewership with the condition that the timings of these serials should be changed. Accordingly, telecast timing of these serials was suitably changed and the serials became immensely popular and Doordarshan earned a lot of revenue. For the morning telecast of Shanti at 9.30 hours. Doordarshan earned a revenue of Rs. 50,000/- to Rs. 1 lakh per day and for Swabhimaan it was Rs. 3 lakh per day. Therefore, the lure of earning revenue and the Planning Commission's instructions to internally generate revenue has guided Doordarshan to grant lengthy extension to some serials.

114. The Committee is extremely unhappy to note that the Planning Commission's instructions to increase internal generation of revenue instead of relying upon budgetary support has compelled Doordarshan to grant lengthy extension to some serials like 'Shanti', 'Swabhimaan', 'Junoon', 'Chandrakanta' etc. In this context, the Committee also notes that for the telecast of the serial 'Shanti' Doordarshan earns a revenue of Rs. 50,000/- to Rs. one lakh per day and for Swabhimaan Rs. three lakh per day. The Committee appreciates that Doordarshan is in need of funds and it is very difficult to overlook the amount of revenue Doordarshan is fetching from some serials as mentioned above. But the social cost at which Doordarshan is earning these revenue is immensely astonishing. The Committee does not intend to cast aspersion on the credibility of the Producers of those serials. But mindless extension of these serials

has caused extreme boredom in the viewers because the original story line of these serials has been distorted and the theme deviated. The Committee, therefore, feels that it is high time the Ministry, Prasar Bharati and Doordarshan recognize their public obligations and respect the viewers' sentiments. They should think twice before giving unnecessarily lengthy extension to any serial on revenue considerations.

II. Cable Piracy

115. There are often complaints about the poor quality of picture in Doordarshan programmes. The Committee enquired whether the mushroom growth of cable operators in the country especially in metropolitan and urban areas, has in any way contributed towards this deterioration in the quality of Doordarshan programmes and if so, whether there were any guidelines to control the private channels or cable operators.

116. The CEO, Prasar Bharati submitted to the Committee during evidence that the issue of cable piracy had become a matter of grave concern because the cable operators were sabotaging Doordarshan signal by transmitting it on a 'Jagi' antenna instead of a 'Dish' antenna resulting in poor picture quality of Doordarshan programmes. The Ministry was, therefore, planning to bring forward an Ordinance making it obligatory on the part of cable operators to give Doordarshan the same treatment as given to the Private Channels.

117. As regards control over private channels the Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting replied that many of the private channels were not registered companies in the country and were operating from outside. Because these private channels were uplinking from outside and merely downlinking here, the control mechanism for the Ministry was through cable operators and not through the channels. However, once the private channels started uplinking from within the country then a greater degree of control could be brought in.

118. The Secretary, Information & Broadcasting supplemented the CEO, Prasar Bharati by stating that the issue would be taken up in the State Information Ministers' Meeting. He further stated that the issue had been discussed more in the context of film sector rather than on the TV sector. However, the Government was seized of the matter.

119. The Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting further stated that the quality of Doordarshan transmission was not as sharp as that of the other private channels and that could be a factor in leading to people switching over to other channels. He simultaneously assured the Committee that to the extent legislative changes or any change at a policy level could help in the matter, the Government would be very positively inclined to take them in consultation with the Prasar Bharati.

120. The Committee then asked whether any study had been undertaken to gauge the loss of viewers of Doordarshan in view of telecast of so many private channels through cable operators. The CEO, Prasar Bharati in response stated that there was no such institution which undertook this kind of study. The only existing Institution which based its projections on the study of the four Metropolitan cities was operated with vested interests and biased against Doordarshan. The Prasar Bharati, thereof, dismantled that system and a new system for such study would take shape within one month covering about twenty four cities.

121. The Committee expressed its apprehension that whether the poor quality of pictures could be attributed to cable sabotage or it was due to cassette problem. The CEO, Prasar Bharati responded that they had imported a large quantity of cassettes and were supplying them to different stations to ensure that there was no distortion of picture on that account.

122. The Committee is disturbed to note that cable piracy has become a serious menace to the picture quality of Doordarshan channels as the cable operators are sabotaging Doordarshan signal by transmitting it on "Jagi" antenna instead of on 'Dish' antenna. The matter is alarming in view of the fact that due to such sabotage which results in the deterioration of the sharpness of the picture quality of Doordarshan *vis-a-vis* the private channels, viewers are switching over to other channels. However, the Committee finds some consolation in the assurances given by the CEO, Prasar Bharati and the Secretary Ministry of Information & Broadcasting that the matter would be discussed in the State Information Ministers' Meeting and it is planned to bring forward an ordinance making it obligatory on the part of cable operators to give Doordarshan the same treatment as given to the private channels. The committee recommends to both the Ministry and Prasar Bharati to take up the matter with utmost

seriousness and bring forward the required legislation without much loss of time so that some control is exercised over the cable operators and they are not allowed to discriminate against Doordarshan.

123. The Committee notes that Prasar Bharati has discontinued an earlier system of gauging the loss of Doordarshan viewers to private channels through cable operators as that system of study was biased against Doordarshan and operated with vested interests covering only four Metropolitan cities. In its place, Prasar Bharati is trying to introduce a new system which would cover about twenty-four cities. The Committee would like Prasar Bharati to expedite the matter so that timely corrective action is taken in case the study points out loss of viewers. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the progress made in this regard.

124. The Committee further recommends that Doordarshan should ensure the quality of its cassettes also to improve the quality of picture on T.V. Prasar Bharati's import of a large quantity of cassettes and their supply to different Doordarshan Kendras is a step in right direction.

III. Programme Evaluation

125. To a specific query of the Committee regarding the methods of evaluation of the programmes telecast by Doordarshan with a view to deciding its quality as well as popularity, the DG, Doordarshan replied that Doordarshan's Audience Research Television Ratings *i.e.* DART system gives the ratings of various programmes. There was also one more organisation called IMRP which gives television rating points. The witness further claimed that if these ratings were any indication of the popularity of programmes, then Doordarshan was head and shoulder above private channels.

126. When the Committee enquired whether there was any scientific mechanism to evaluate programmes, the CEO, Prasar Bharati replied in the negative. He, however, stated that production centres were there to give the feedback. Secondly, the viewers keep on writing to Doordarshan all the time about the quality and popularity of the programmes. Thirdly, there are Audience Research Department both in Doordarshan and AIR to undertake field surveys and provide feedback on audience reaction and popularity of the programmes.

127. The Committee then asked whether Doordarshan's own Audience Research Wing was competent and impartial enough to evaluate the quality and popularity of programmes telecast by Doordarshan and whether it would not be more prudent to entrust the job to any outside body. In reply, it was stated that Doordarshan's Audience Research Section had professional manpower who have specialised knowledge in research methods and the data provided by Audience Research are widely used by Advertisers, Advertising Agencies etc. Moreover, professional and academic Institutions have accepted the competence and impartiality of the findings.

128. It was further stated that Doordarshan proposed to enter into an agreement with a reputed market research organisation to provide ratings based on electronic meters which could give more sophisticated analysis.

129. The Committee notes that Doordarshan Audience Research Television Ratings (DART), evaluates quality and popularity of programmes on the basis of feed back received from the production centres and viewers. But all these methods, although useful sometimes serve little purpose unless and untill there is a scientific mechanism to evaluate the performance of Doordarshan programmes. This kind of scientific mechanism is not there, as admitted by the CEO, Prasar Bharati during evidence. The Committee feels that although Doordarshan's Audience Research Section has professional manpower who have specialised knowledge in research analysis, it would be prudent to entrust the job to any outside body. The Committee therefore, recommends that Doordarshan should consider entering into an agreement with important reputed Market Research Organisation to provide ratings based on Electronic Meters, which could provide feedback on audience reaction and popularity of the programmes in a more scientific, without of course dismantling its Audience Research Section.

IV. Script Piracy

130. The Committee received several complaints that sometimes scripts submitted by unknown but meritorious producers were being pirated/stolen in connivance with Doordarshan officials. The Committee desired to know the reasons for it. In reply, it was stated that complaints regarding piracy/theft of transcripts by individual writers, if received, were looked into by Doordarshan. As a remedial measure,

Doordarshan always insisted upon the offerers of the programmes to give an undertaking. It was further stated that no specific complaint about script piracy has been proved so far.

131. Being not satisfied with the reply the Committee during evidence, asked whether any complaints were received regarding script piracy and if so what mechanism had been evolved to check such piracy. The Additional Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in response stated that there were complaints regarding script piracy but it was very difficult to check it. The Committee then asked if after production of a programme somebody makes a claim that it impinges his copyright then whose burden it would be to fight it out. In reply, the DG, Doordarshan stated that, that would be a dispute between the two parties and Doordarshan did not come into picture as it was indemnified as per the agreement.

132. Still not satisfied the Committee further desired to know from Prasar Bharati whether any instance of script piracy had come to the notice of Prasar Bharati and if so how many complaints were received and what action was taken thereon. The CEO, Prasar Bharati replied that generally two types of complaints were received regarding script piracy. One type of complaint was coming just out of rivalries where the rival producers tried to harass each other. The second type of complaint was the genuine one where the script or idea had actually been stolen. And whenever such genuine complaints were received, they were enquired into by the Deputy-Director General in-charge and depending upon the results of the inquiry, the person who had stolen the script was disqualified and thus there was civil action open to the aggrieved person.

133. To a specific query of the Committee whether scripts submitted by various producers were properly stored, the DG, Doordarshan replied that the way the scripts were received and stored required improvement. He further stated that they were looking for a system by which some stitching could be done otherwise the scripts/tapes got separated from the forwarding letter and it became almost impossible to again match the both as most of the producers did not write clearly the name of their production, company etc. on the scripts/ tapes.

134. During evidence after the constitution of Prasar Bharati, the Committee enquired how long did it take to process and finalise after

a proposal was received and acknowledged. The CEO, Prasar Bharati replied that the entire process took time as sometimes the slot might become available after three months and sometimes after two years and that was because only when the running serials came to an end slots were made available.

135. The Committee pointed out that once the script was received and acknowledged it should not take too long to finalise a proposal. The CEO, Prasar Bharati replied that he would look into the matter and prescribe a time-limit that within two months the person who had submitted his script must be informed one way or the other.

136. The Committee is perturbed to note the public complaints that scripts submitted by lesser known but meritorious producers are being pirated/stolen in connivance with Doordarshan officials. The Additional Secretary's submission that it is very difficult to check script piracy and the DG's statement that Doordarshan does not come into picture whenever there is a dispute between two parties over script piracy are matters of grave concern. The position, however, seems to have improved to some extent after the inception of Prasar Bharati as genuine complaints of script piracy are enquired into by the Deputy Director General in-charge and the person who steals is disqualified. The Committee feels that with proper preventive measures it will not be difficult to check script piracy. Doordarshan should not remain a silent spectator to the dispute between two parties on the plea that it is indemnified as per the agreement. The Committee would also like the authorities to explore the feasibility of entrusting enquiry related to this matter to an independent agency so that impartial investigation is carried out in case any insider is involved in such piracy/theft.

137. The Committee notes that the way the scripts/tapes are received and stored, requires improvement, as admitted by the DG, Doordarshan. It feels that with meticulous storage of scripts/tapes the chances of script piracy can be greatly reduced. The Committee, therefore, recommends that necessary arrangements be made to store the scripts properly and securely.

138. The Committee is surprised to note that after the receipt and acknowledgement of a proposal it takes three months to two years to process and finalise the same depending upon the availability of the time slot. In the opinion of the Committee, there should be a reasonable time limit for processing and finalising each

proposal received and acknowledged thereafter. The Committee recommends that the matter be looked into with urgency and the producer be informed one way or the other within a fixed time period, say two months after his proposal is received and acknowledged. This way, the Committee feels, the producer would have no complaints against unusual delay in processing his proposal. Moreover, the sooner the proposals are finalised the lesser is the chance of piracy.

V. Acknowledgement of Proposals and Viewers' letters

139. As regards the method of acknowledgement of the proposals submitted by outside producers and the time taken to consider a particular proposal the Committee was informed that *suo motto* proposals keep on coming to the Doordarshan Kendras/Director General, Doordarshan and they are entered in a Register. These proposals are first checked to ensure that they were complete in all respects *e.g.* whether details of the track record of the technical crew, their consent letters budget details etc. had been given alongwith the prescribed fee of Rs. 5000/- for consideration of the proposal. Shortcomings, if any, are pointed out to the producer and after the proposal is found to be complete in all respects, it takes about two months time to process that provided the programme budget had scope for such commissioning.

140. During evidence, the Committee pointed out that there were complaints that the records of the proposals submitted by the producers were not properly maintained nor acknowledged. The DG submitted that it was true that due to large number of applications which reached Doordarshan, it had become a problem to keep a proper record. He further stated that on an average they got at least fifty requests per day for commissioning of programmes which came through different channels *i.e.* either through the office of the Minister or directly in person or by post or through representations etc.

141. To a specific query whether all the requests or proposals submitted to Doordarshan were invariably acknowledged, the DG, Doordarshan replied that those who came in person to submit the proposal normally took the acknowledgement. However, for those proposals which came by post or through Minister's office, Doordarshan was trying to acknowledge them as much as possible.

142. When the Committee asked whether the system of acknowledging the proposals required any improvement the DG, Doordarshan admitted that the system required improvement and they were trying to introduce a system by which (through a small computer terminal at the reception itself), the producer would be able to know the position and stage of his proposal and process his own case in the way he thought fit.

143. During on-the-spot Study Tour to different places the Committee was informed by various public representatives that many Doordarshan Kendras did not acknowledge in writing the viewers' letters in response to the respective programme being telecast. In this context the Committee enquired whether acknowledgement of viewers' letters would not encourage the viewers to send more valuable suggestions for qualitative improvement in various programmes and if so what steps were taken to respond to viewers' suggestions. In reply, it was stated that most of the Doordarshan Kendras had a programme for sending replies to viewers' letters where various suggestions made by the viewers were discussed and the feasibility or otherwise of the suggestions were explained.

144. It was simultaneously stated that letters which contained useful suggestions wre replied by most of the Kendras but as the number of letters received in some Kendras was large, it was difficult to send written answers to all the letters.

145. The Committee then pointed out that Calcutta Doordarshan had introduced a system of giving prizes to the best viewer's view and enquired whether other DDKs also followed a similar pattern. It was replied that the response to the newly introduced features of DDK Calcutta was yet to be studied for a few months and depending upon the sucess it would be extended to other Kendras.

146. The Committee is unhappy to note that due to larger number of proposals for programmes, it has become very difficult for Doordarshan Directorate to keep record of them. The Committee also notes that the proposals which come by post or through Minister's office are not acknowledged in every case. This state of affairs substantiates the public allegations that the records of the proposal submitted by the producers are neither maintained properly nor acknowledged duly. The Committee is, therefore, of the view that Doordarshan Directorate should maintain the basic office

etiquettes in acknowledging and recording each and every proposal, notwithstanding their numbers. As assured to it during evidence, the Committee would like Doordarshan to urgently streamline the procedure and introduce computer terminal at the reception itself through which the producer would be able to know the position of his proposal. The Committee is of the opinion that with technological break-through it is not an uphill task to acknowledge and record various proposals received. Moreover, unless and until the proposals are properly recorded and acknowledged, Doordarshan is bound to invite criticism from public.

147. The Committee also recommends that Doordarshan Directorate should advise the Regional Kendras to strengthen their respective programmes for replies to viewers' letters containing useful suggestions in the light of public grievances.

148. The Committee further recommends that incentive of giving prizes to the best viewer's view as introduced by Calcutta Doordarshan Kendra be extended to other prominent Regional Kendras also so that viewers are encouraged to send more valuable suggestions for overall qualitative improvement of programmes.

VI. Schemes for Awards/Prizes

149. The Committee was informed that a scheme for awarding prizes to production and engineering staff of Doordarshan was instituted in early 80s when a majority of Doordarshan programmes were produced in-house. But later on as a large number of programmes were acquired from outside, it was decided to review the scheme and a new scheme for National Awards for television was being formulated.

150. During evidence when the Committee enquired if there was any plan to revive the scheme, the Additional Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting replied that the Awards Scheme for encouragement of production of qualitative in-house programmes which was in vogue in the 80s was as a matter of fact, not much implemented and that was why the scheme was given up. But later on the Ministry had taken a decision that in order to motivate the people working in Doordarshan the scheme must be reviewed and accordingly revival of the scheme was on the anvil. The Additional Secretary further added in reply to another query that it would be reintroduced during the year.

151. Subsequently, however, in an updated information note furnished to the Committee in mid 1998, it has again been replied that the new scheme was being prepared to provide incentive for high quality in-house productions.

152. The Committee observes that the scheme for awarding prizes to Production and Engineering staff introduced in early eighties was later on given up as it was hardly implemented. Subsequently, the Ministry felt the need to revive the scheme in order to motivate the people working in Doordarshan. However, despite the Additional Secretary's assurance during evidence that the scheme would be revived in 1997, it is found from information furnished to the Committee in mid 1998 that the scheme is yet to be revived. Taking into consideration the fact that recognition of talent in one way or another is the best motivation for the people working in any organisation, the Committee recommends to the Ministry to revive the Award scheme without further loss of time.

VII. Grievances Redressal Machinery

153. The Committee has been informed that though there was a plethora of complaints relating to malpractices in Doordarshan Kendra yet concrete incriminatory evidence is not furnished by complainant. However only eight specific complaints were registered between 1 August 1995 and 31 July, 1998 in the Vigilance Section of the Directorate. Three out of them have been closed after enquiry and in the remaining five, Departmental enquiry was still pending.

154. The Committee desired to be informed of the nature of the aforesaid complaints, the designation of the officers against whom allegations were made, the stage of their progress and to know the reasons as to why three out of the eight cases registered were closed. The Prasar Bharati in a note furnished later on gave the following details of these cases to the Committee :

Sl. No.	Date of complaint	Officer involved	Complaint	Action Taken
1	2	3	4	5
1.	9.4.96	(i) Sh. P.K. Munshi, Sg. Engr.	Misappropriation of Govt. money	Matter is under investigation by the Ministry.
		(ii) Ms. Jharna Das ASD	Allotment of prog. to the brothers of Ms. Jharna Das	

1	2	3	4	5
2.	29.2.96	Smt. Vimala Mittal, Dir.	(i) Irregularities in selection of commissioned programmes	A reply was sent to the Min. CBI has inquired into the matter and asked for issue of warning which is under issue.
			(ii) Apptt. of technician	The comments have been called for to process the case.
			(iii) Misuse of transport	Inquiry report recd. is under examination.
3.	12.4.96	Surprise check by local CBI of DDK, Bhubaneswar	(i) Appointts.,	Irregularities in appointments are under consideration of the staff sections concerned.
			(ii) Commissioning of programmes	Ministry has been requested to refer this case to CBI.
			(iii) Engineering Stores	Comments have been called in respect of Stores.
			(iv) Transport	Nothing has been substantiated.
4.	3.9.96	Sh. Farooq Nazki, Dir. & Sh. Bashir Badgami, EP	Malpractices & embezzlement in DDK, Srinagar	Inquiry report awaited from DDG (KK)
5.	31.12.96	(i) Sh. M.L. Kharoo, Prod. Asstt.	Running of a private firm	Anonymous/ pseudonymous complaint.
		(ii) Sh. Satish Dhar, Prod. Asstt.	Acquired properties	Ministry has closed both the cases

1	2	3	4	5
6.	19.5.97	Sh. Harish Awasthi, DDG	Irregularities in passing TV serials on Kashmir.	Pseudonymous complaints cases closed with the approval of DG.
7.	17.9.97	Names not specified	Irregularities in passing TV serial 'Shanti' and others.	Case closed with approval of Secretary I&B.
8.	17.12.97	Names not specified	Irregularities reg. the TV serial 'Yug' and others.	Dte.'s comments sent to Min. of I&B on 1.5.1998.

155. The Committee asked whether there was transparency in norms laid down for selection of proposal. The CEO, Prasar Bharati replied that earlier complaints made all types of allegations and a very foul atmosphere was prevalent. But after the inception of Prasar Bharati complaints of malpractices were not there. The CEO is stated to be himself meeting producers and outsiders who have vouched that there was very distinct improvement after Prasar Bharati came into existence. Secondly, the first notification the CEO issued after assuming power was that no paper in the Organisation would be marked as confidential or secret. As a result , the public would have a free access to every file and document of the Organisation and thereby could find out that in serial making process how a particular serial was approved or rejected. The Prasar Bharati considered it to be sufficient public pressure on the officials who processed the cases to see that arbitrary decision were not taken. Thirdly, the Prasar Bharati scrapped the Panel of Producers earlier maintained by Doordarshan, because quite a few of these producers were not even familiar with the technique of production. As a result of it few programmes were assigned on the basis of recommendations and pressure. Then it was only Prasar Bharati who would decide the sort of programme that was needed taking into view the credentials and background experience of a producer. Lastly, each proposal was examined by a five Member Programmes Evaluation and Costing Committee and therefore, there were remote chances of bribery and malpractices. The CEO supported

his argument by stating that unless a producer corrupted all the five members of the Committee or offered more bribe, there was no way he could get his script approved.

156. As regards acceptance of sub-standard programmes the CEO, Prasar Bharati stated that it could happen either owing to pressures or recommendations or some other reasons. The Prasar Bharati was stated to be trying its best to ensure that pressures/recommendations etc. were completely eliminated, their officers protected from outside interference and adequate confidence was instilled in them.

157. The Committee asked about the channels for receiving complaints and the action taken to dispose them. The representative of Prasar Bharati replied that the complaints were received through three channels *i.e.* the Department of Public Grievances and Pensions, from various Ministries, the Prime Minister's office and President's office and sometimes the complaints were addressed direct to the CEO, Prasar Bharati, Director General Doordarshan or to the Additional D.G. These complaints, on the basis of the gravity and level of allegations were considered for investigation if there was a *prima facie* case. The file was put up to the Director General, Doordarshan whenever he was available or to the Chief Executive Officer, Prasar Bharati in the new set up and a view was taken whether there was a case for investigation. It was further stated that invariably an officer senior to the officer who had been alleged against was deputed to investigate the complaint and make a recommendation. Based on his preliminary recommendation, further action was taken in consultation with the Ministry or if considered necessary, with the help of the CBI or the Vigilance Commission.

158. The Committee then asked the CEO, Prasar Bharati what procedure he followed to dispose of the complaints received by him. The CEO replied that he immediately took the complaint on the file and ask the ADG (Administration) to enquire into it. If any truth was found in the allegations then very severe punishment was considered against the person concerned.

159. The Committee suggested that the Prasar Bharati should announce or advertise voluntarily that anybody having any complaint/ grievance could lodge the same without being scared. The CEO, Prasar Bharati agreed to the suggestion and assured that he would issue a notification to that effect.

160. The Committee is anguished to note that there is a plethora of complaints of corrupt practices in Doordarshan Kendra. But surprisingly, only eight of them have been registered between August, 1995 and July, 1998 with the Vigilance Section of Doordarshan Directorate. Moreover, from the information furnished by Prasar Bharati in this regard, it would be seen that certain cases of complaint have been closed without assigning any reasons whatsoever. In some cases names of the officials who have allegadly committed irregularities in passing TV serials 'Shanti' and 'Yug' have not been specified. In one case *i.e.* allotment of programmes to one's own kith and kin, action taken has not been indicated. Again, in certain cases, matter is under investigation of the Ministry or reports are awaited from the concerned DDKs. As an impression has been given that this information has been prepared hurriedly, the Committee would like Prasar Bharati to expeditiously apprise the Committee of the required details and the action taken against those found guilty. Taking into account the fact that only eight complaints have been registered in a period of three years, the Committee is inclined to believe that the system of registering complaints with the vigilance section is complicated and cumbersome. The Committee, therefore impresses upon Prasar Bharati and the Ministry to streamline and simplify the procedure of registering complaints so that malpractices and irregularities resorted to by the Doordarshan officials are curbed.

161. The Committee further recommends that Prasar Bharati should bring it to the notice of public that persons having any complaint/grievance against DD officials could lodge the same without fear or hesitation. As assured by the CEO during evidence, the Committee hopes that a notification to this effect would soon be issued and brought to the notice of the public.

162. The Committee is glad to note that in order to eliminate acceptance of sub-standard programmes, Prasar Bharati is trying its best to ignore pressure, recommendations etc. by protecting their officers from outside interference and instilling confidence in them. While commending these measures, the Committee recommends that apart from complaints of outside interference, inside manipulation and corruption is also to be looked into seriously so that malpractices resulting in the telecast of sub standard programmes are eliminated.

163. The Committee notes that no minimise corrupt practices, Prasar Bharati has been taking a number of steps viz. scrapping the panel of 400 producers, notifying that no paper in the organisation be marked as confidential, interacting with the producers and general public etc. But the Committee is hardly convinced that with these measures alone, the Prasar Bharati would be able to eliminate corruption from the organisation as claimed by the CEO, Prasar Bharati during evidence. Undoubtedly, there has been some improvement after the inception or Prasar Bharati but to eliminate corruption from an organisation which has been under its sway over so many years persistently gigantic efforts are needed. The Committee, therefore, recommends that besides resorting to the above mentioned measures, Prasar Bharati should sincerely chalk out appropriate and periodical plans and strategies so that the purpose of Prasar Bharati is well served.

NEW DELHI;
11 *February*, 1999
22 *Magha*, 1920 *(Saka)*

SOMNATH CHATTERJEE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Communications.

APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF SUB-COMMITTEE 'C' OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1996-97)

Sub-Committee 'C' of the Standing Committee on Communications sat on Tuesday, the 14 January, 1997 from 11.00 to 13.30 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Geeta Mukherjee — *Convener*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Smt. Bhavna Chikhalia
3. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
4. Shri Mrutyunjaya Nayak

Rajya Sabha

5. Shri Shatrughan Prasad Sinha

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ram Autar Ram — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES (NON-OFFICIAL)

1. Shri Gopal Saxena — Retd. Director, CPC, Doordarshan
2. Shri Shanti Prasad Agarwal — Retd. Controller of Programmes, Doordarshan

2. At the outset, the convener welcomed the Non-official witness to the sitting of the Sub-Committee.

3. The Sub-Committee heard the views of the Non-official witnesses on the subject "Doordarshan—Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers." The Members of the Sub-Committee also sought clarifications and suggestions on various pertinent issues relating to the subject.

4. The Convener then thanked the witnesses for appearing before the Sub-Committee as well as for furnishing valuable information on the subject.

5. A verbatim record of the proceedings of the sitting has been kept.

The Sub-Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FIRST SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1996-97)

The Committee sat on Friday, the 24 January, 1997 from 11.00 hrs. to 13.30 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Somnath Chatterjee — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri K.L. Sharma
3. Prof. Rasa Singh Rawat
4. Smt. Sheela Gautam
5. Smt. Bhavna Chikhalia
6. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
7. Shri Mrutyunjaya Nayak
8. Shri M.P. Veerendra Kumar
9. Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav
10. Shri R. Devadas
11. Shri Kothapalli Subbarayudu

Rajya Sabha

12. Shrimati Veena Verma
13. Shri Iqbal Singh
14. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
15. Shri Ahmed Patel
16. Shri Govindram Miri

17. Shri Shatrughan Prasad Sinha
18. Dr. Ramendra Kumar Yadav Ravi
19. Shri Md. Salim
20. Shri S. Austin
21. Shri Ish Dutt Yadav
22. Shri Satish Pradhan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ram Autar Ram — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Under Secretary*

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING

1. Shri N.P. Nawani — Secretary
2. Shri V.K. Majotra — Addl. Secy. Broadcasting
3. Shri S.K. Naik — Addl. Secy. & Financial Advr.
4. Shri K.S. Sarma — Director General

2. At the outset the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to the sitting of the Committee.

3. Then the Committee sought certain clarifications from the representatives of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting on the subject "Doordarshan—Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers."

4. The Committee decided to sit again on a later date as the deliberations on the subject remained unfinished.

5. A verbatim record of the sitting has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX III

MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1996-97)

The Committee met on Thursday, the 5th June, 1997 from 11.00 hrs. to 13.00 hrs. in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Geeta Mukherjee — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Harin Pathak
3. Dr. S.N. Jatiya
4. Prof. Rasa Singh Rawat
5. Smt. Sheela Gautam
6. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
7. Shri Tarachand Bhagora
8. Shri Somjibhai Damor
9. Shri Mrutyunjaya Nayak
10. Shri Neil Aloysius O' Brien
11. Shri R. Devadas
12. Shri V.P. Shanmuga Sundram
13. Shri Churchill Alemao

Rajya Sabha

14. Smt. Veena Verma
15. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
16. Shri Ahmed Patel

17. Shri Govindram Miri

18. Shri Shatrughan Prasad Sinha

19. Shri Md. Salim

SECRETARIAT

Shri S.K. Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

1. Shri V.K. Majotra — Additional Secretary

2. Shri K.S. Sarma — Joint Secretary (B) and Director General, Doordarshan

2. At the outset the Chairperson welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to the sitting of the Committee.

3. The Committee sought certain clarifications on issues relating to the subject "Doordarshan—Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers."

4. A verbatim record of the sitting has been kept.

5. The Committee decided to sit again at 15.00 hrs.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IV

MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1996-97)

The Committee met on Thursday, the 5th June; 1997 from 15.00 hrs. to 16.30 hrs. in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Smt. Geeta Mukherjee — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Prof. Rasa Singh Rawat
3. Smt. Sukhbuns Kaur
4. Shri Somjibhai Damor
5. Shri Neil Aloysius O' Brien
6. Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav
7. Shri R. Devadas

Rajya Sabha

8. Shri Govindram Miri

SECRETARIAT

Shri S.K. Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

1. Shri V.K. Majotra — Additional Secretary
2. Shri K.S. Sarma — Joint Secretary (B) and Director General, Doordarshan

2. The Committee took up for deliberations the issues, which could not be covered in the preceeding meeting on the subject "Doordarshan—Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers."

3. The Chairperson thanked the officials of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting for furnishing valuable information to the Committee and for expressing free and frank views on various points raised by the Members.

4. A verbatim record of the sitting has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX V

MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

The Committee met on Friday, the 14th August, 1998 from 10.30 hrs. to 11.15 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Somnath Chatterjee — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Dowarka Parshad Bairwa
3. Shri Mahendra Baitha
4. Shri M. Durai
5. Shri Giridhar Gamang
6. Shri A. Ganeshamurthi
7. Smt. Sheela Gautam
8. Shri T. Govindan
9. Shri Jay Krishna Mandal
10. Shri Shantilal Purushottamdas Patel
11. Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil
12. Shri Madan Vishwanath Patil
13. Shri Baijnath Rawat
14. Shri K. Asungba Sangtam
15. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
16. Shri Krishan Lal Sharma
17. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh

18. Shri Nakli Singh
19. Shri Rajveer Singh
20. Shri Surender Singh
21. Shri P.C. Thomas
22. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy
23. Shri Surendra Prasad Yadav (Jhanjharpur)

Rajya Sabha

24. Shri R.N. Arya
25. Shri Kartar Singh Duggal
26. Shri Dawa Lama
27. Smt. Chandresh Kumari
28. Shri R. Margabandu
29. Shri Narendra Mohan
30. Shri K. Kalavenkata Rao
31. Smt. Veena Verma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

1. Shri P.G. Mankad — Secretary
2. Shri S.K. Naik — Addl. Secy. and Financial Advisor
3. Shri R.R. Shah — Addl. Secretary

PRASAR BHARATI

1. Shri S.S. Gill — Chief Executive Officer, Prasar Bharati
2. Shri K.S. Sarma — Joint Secretary
3. Shri B.K. Dey — Eng.-in-Chief

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the CEO, Prasar Bharati as well as other officers of the Ministry and Prasar Bharati who accompanied them.

3. The Committee sought certain clarifications on the issues relating to the subject "Doordarshan—Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers."

4. The Chairman, thanked the officials for furnishing valuable information to the Committee and for expressing free and frank views on various points raised by the Members.

5. A verbatim record of the sitting has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VI

MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

The Committee met on Monday, the 24th August, 1998 from 11.00 hrs. to 13.30 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Somnath Chatterjee — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Jay Krishna Mandal
3. Shri K.L. Sharma
4. Shri Nakli Singh
5. Shri Rajveer Singh
6. Shri Baijnath Rawat
7. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
8. Smt. Sheela Gautam
9. Shri K. Asungba Sangtam
10. Shri Shantilal Purushottamdas Patel
11. Shri Mahendra Baitha
12. Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil
13. Shri Dowarka Parshad Bairwa
14. Shri Somjibhai Punjabhai Damor
15. Shri Chhatrapal Singh
16. Shri P.C. Thomas
17. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy

18. Shri Surendra Prasad Yadav
19. Shri M. Durai
20. Shri Surender Singh
21. Shri Madan Viswanath Patil

Rajya Sabha

22. Smt. Veena Verma
23. Shri Kartar Singh Duggal
24. Shri Dawa Lama
25. Smt. Chandresh Kumari
26. Shri R. Margabandu
27. Shri Kanak Mal Katara
28. Shri Shatrughan Sinha

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING

1. Shri P.G. Mankad — Secretary
2. Shri S.K. Naik — Addl. Secy. & Financial Advisor
3. Shri R.R. Shah — Addl. Secretary

PRASAR BHARATI

1. Shri S.S. Gill — Chief Executive Officer, Prasar Bharati
2. Shri K.S. Sarma — Joint Secretary
3. Shri B.K. Dey — Engg.-in-Chief
4. Shri T.R. Malakar — DDG

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the CEO, Prasar Bharati as well as other officers of the Ministry and Prasar Bharati accompanying them.

3. The Committee sought certain clarifications on the issues relating to subject of "Doordarshan Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers" which remained unfinished on 14 August, 1998.

4. A verbatim record of the sitting has been kept.

5. The Chairman thanked the officials for furnishing valuable information to the Committee and for expressing free and frank views on various points raised by the Members.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VII

MINUTES OF THE FIFTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 25th August, 1998 from 10.30 hrs. to 13.15 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Somnath Chatterjee — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Dowarka Parshad Bairwa
3. Shri Mahendra Baitha
4. Shri Somjibhai Punjabhai Damor
5. Shri Giridhar Gamang
6. Smt. Sheela Gautam
7. Shri Jay Krishna Mandal
8. Shri Shantilal Purushottamdas Patel
9. Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil
10. Shri Madan Vishwanath Patil
11. Shri Baijnath Rawat
12. Shri Chandrashekhar Sahu
13. Shri K. Asungba Sangtam
14. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
15. Shri Krishan Lal Sharma
16. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh
17. Shri Nakli Singh

18. Shri Rajveer Singh
19. Shri Surender Singh
20. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy
21. Shri Surendra Prasad Yadav (Jhanjharpur)

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri R.N. Arya
23. Shri Kartar Singh Duggal
24. Shri Kanak Mal Katara
25. Shri Dawa Lama
26. Smt. Chandresh Kumari
27. Shri R. Margabandu
28. Shri Narendra Mohan
29. Smt. Veena Verma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Ashok Balwani — *Assistant Director*
4. Shri Bhupesh Kumar — *Assistant Director*

LIST OF WITNESSES MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING

1. Shri P.G. Mankad — Secretary
2. Shri S.K. Naik — Addl. Secy. & Fin. Adv.
3. Shri R.R. Shah — Addl. Secretary
4. Shri K.S. Sarma — Joint Secretary (B)
5. Shri P. Srivastava — Director (BP)
6. Shri K. Ganesan — Under Secretary
7. Shri H.S. Chaudhari — Under Secretary (TV)

PRASAR BHARATI

8.	Shri S.S. Gill	—	Chief Executive Officer
9.	Dr. O.P. Kejriwal	—	Dir. General, A.I.R.
10.	Shri B.K. De	—	Engineer-in-Chief
11.	Shri H.M. Joshi	—	Eng.-in-Chief
12.	Shri T.R. Malakar	—	Dy. Director General
13.	Shri K. Kunhikrishnan	—	Dy. Director General
14.	Shri K. Tlanthanga	—	Dy. Director General
15.	Shri K.M. Annes-ul-Haq	—	Dy. Director General
16.	Shri Rakesh Bahadur	—	Dy. Director General
17.	Dr. P. K. Seth	—	Dy. Director General
18.	Shri R. K. Gupta	—	Chief Engineer
19.	Shri G. Chatterjee	—	Under Secretary

2. At the outset the Chairman welcomed the Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting and the officials of Prasar Bharati and the Ministry accompanying him.

3. Thereafter, certain issues relating to "Doordarshan—Production of Programmes" which could not be concluded during the evidence of the representatives of 'Prasar Bharati and Ministry of Information & Broadcasting' held on 24.8.1998 were taken up.

4. ** ** ** ** **

5. A verbatim record of the sitting has been kept.

6. The Chairman thanked the officials of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting and Prasar Bharati for furnishing valuable information to the Committee and for free and frank answers and the cooperation that they extended to the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VIII

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-THIRD SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

The Committee met on Thursday, the 17th December, 1998 from 15.00 hours to 16.00 hours in Room No. '140', Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri K.L. Sharma — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mahendra Baitha
3. Shri M. Durai
4. Smt. Sheela Gautam
5. Shri T. Govindan
6. Shri Rizwan Zaheer Khan
7. Shri Shantilal Purushottamdas Patel
8. Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil
9. Shri Chandrashekhar Sahu
10. Shri K. Asungba Sangtam
11. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
12. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh
13. Shri Nakli Singh
14. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy
15. Shri Surendra Prasad Yadav (Jhanjharpur)

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri R.N. Arya
17. Shri Kartar Singh Duggal
18. Shri Kanak Mal Katara
19. Shri Narendra Mohan
20. Shri Kuldip Nayyar
21. Shri K. Kalavenkata Rao
22. Shri Shatrughan Sinha
23. Smt. Veena Verma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri A.S. Chera — *Under Secretary*

2. ***** ***** *****

3. The Committee also considered Draft Report on 'Doordarshan production of programmes in-house and by outside producers' and deferred the consideration.

4. ***** ***** *****

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IX

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1998-99)

The Standing Committee on Communications sat on Thursday the 11th February, 1999 from 15.00 hours to 16.15 hours in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Somnath Chatterjee — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mahendra Baitha
3. Shri Giridhar Gamang
4. Smt. Sheela Gautam
5. Shri T. Govindan
6. Shri Mahesh Kumar Mithabhai Kanodia
7. Shri Jay Krishna Mandal
8. Shri Shantilal Purushottamdas Patel
9. Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil
10. Shri Baijnath Rawat
11. Shri Chandrashekhar Sahu
12. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
13. Shri Krishan Lal Sharma
14. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh
15. Shri Nakli Singh
16. Shri Rajveer Singh
17. Shri Surender Singh

18. Dr. (Smt.) Prabha Thakur
19. Shri P.C. Thomas
20. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy
21. Shri Surendra Prasad Yadav (Jhanjharpur)

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri Raj Babbar
23. Shri Kartar Singh Duggal
24. Shri K. Rahman Khan
25. Shri Dawa Lama
26. Smt. Chandresh Kumari
27. Shri R. Margabandu
28. Shri Narendra Mohan
29. Shri Kuldip Nayyar
30. Ms. Mabel Rebello
31. Smt. Veena Verma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.K. Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri A.S. Chera — *Under Secretary*
4. Shri Bhupesh Kumar — *Assistant Director*

REPRESENTATIVES OF DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1. Shri Anil Kumar — Chairman (TC) & Secretary, DoT
2. Shri Dhanjai Kumar — Addl. Secretary (TC)
3. Shri R.N. Goyal — Advisor (O)
4. Shri S.P. Purwar — Advisor (F)
5. Shri N.R. Mokhariwale — Sr. DDG (CS)

6.	Shri N.K. Mangala	—	DDG (Reglns)
7.	Smt. Anuradha Mitra	—	DDG (LF)
8.	Shri K.K. Sapra	—	Dir. (PHE)
9.	Shri Asim Abbas	—	Dr. (T&C)
10.	Shri Sudhir Kumar	—	Dir. (MST)
11.	Shri F.R. Tirkey	—	ADG (PHB)
12.	Shri N.L. Juneja	—	AD (PHB)

2. ****** ****** ******

3. ****** ****** ******

4. ****** ****** ******

5. The Committee then considered Draft Eighth Report on 'Doordarshan - Production of Programmes in-house and by outside Producers' and adopted the same with some modifications as shown in the Annexure.

6. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise and present the Eighth Report to both the Houses of Parliament.

7. ******* ******* *******

The witnesses then withdrew and the Committee adjourned.